

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/627,434	07/25/2003	Brian R. Pleiman	29939/38600A	2345	
4743	7590 03/09/2005	03/09/2005 EXAMINER			
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP			THOMPSON, HUGH B		
6300 SEARS 7			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606			3634	
,			DATE MAIL ED: 03/09/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

127		. /				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/627,434	PLEIMAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hugh B. Thompson II∕	3634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 N	lovember 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-9 and 11-24</u> is/are pending in the	ne application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6 and 10</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-9,11-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7</u> is/are objected to.	☑ Claim(s) <u>7</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by the f	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 	ts have been received.					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior						
application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-19-89/11-19-99/11-10-99/11-10-99/

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 10/627,434

Art Unit: 3634

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-18, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, the application has recited and argued the essential nature of the structure and arrangement of the base panel, upper panel, openings, and receptacles, to counteract "a tipping moment on the storage device". The applicant should note, that absent the receipt of a long handled tool, there appears to be no tipping moment that is created upon the storage device. The applicant also offers no other structural element of the device alone that creates such a tipping moment. The applicant should note that it is the patentability of the storage device and not its relationship to unclaimed elements such as "long handled tools" that is to be determined. Note that long handled tools are not homogeneous in weight, length, circumference, or any other structural feature that would cause the necessary tipping moment that the applicant relies upon to impart structural limitations to the storage device.

Further, the applicant has now recited that the upper panel is supported "solely" by the risers." The applicant should note that the risers extend from the base panel, so in effect, the upper panels are not "solely" supported by the risers, but are in fact supported by the risers, base panel, and the support surface upon which the storage device is located. Thus, the applicant has

made claims 1 and 17 indefinite with respect to that particular recitation, in an attempt to define over the Hurt reference. In addition, the phrase "constructed and arranged" in each claim is indefinite, as it is unclear as to what defined structure encompasses the phrase.

With respect to claim 24, it is unclear with respect to what "the front end of the base panel extends further forward than the front end of the upper panel." Note that in claim 19, the applicant has specifically recited that "the upper panel (has) a generally triangular shape with a front end and a back corner corresponding respectively to the base panel front end and back corner." If the front end and back corners of both panels do infact correspond to each other, then it is unclear as to how the front end of the base panels extends further forward in claim 24.

Though not an ambiguity per se, claims 4 and 20 recite an "offset horizontal" position between "corresponding" upper and base panel openings/receptacles. The applicant should note that this claim fails to structurally define a specific pattern or location of the openings/receptacles, and that the Hurt reference clearly discloses open chambers 52, any one of which are horizontally offset with respect to the other that is not vertically aligned with a respective opening/receptacle in either upper or base panel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,434

Art Unit: 3634

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hurt #6,460,709. Hurt, as recited in column 1, lines 45-58, column 2, lines 51-65, column 3, lines 64-67, and column 4, lines 1-9, discloses a corner storage device comprised of stackable triangular base/upper panels 10, support posts (not shown), horizontal protrusions 68 that are designed to receive weighted articles, and tool/article receiving receptacles/openings 52, which are vertically aligned when the panels are so stacked and are horizontally offset with non-aligned openings/receptacles in either upper or base panel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurt as applied to claims 1-5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16-18, and 20-23 above, and further in view of Wang #6,508,369. Hurt fails to disclose a base panel receptacle ending in a blind end surface. Wang, as best seen in Figure 3, disclose a storage device 10 having a blind end surface assembly 14, 16, that is used to support long handle articles 50 and prevent their engagement with the ground or other support surface. Therefore, to one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious, as a matter of design choice, to provide the base panel of Hurt with a blind end surface as taught by Wang, so as to prevent engagement with the ground or other support surface of any articles so supported therein, while producing no new and unexpected results.

Page 5

the utility of a storage device 10 having a support surface engaging blind end surface receptacle

19, 21 that has angled sides 20 for drainage purposes. Therefore, to one of ordinary skill in the

art, it would have been obvious, as a matter of design choice, to provide the base panel of Hurt

with an angled blind end surface as taught by Mander et al, so as to provide for drainage

purposes.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, any intervening claims, and rewritten to overcome the Section 112 ambiguities as noted above. The primary reason for the allowable subject matter of claim 7, is the panels being substantially identical other than at the moment negating portion of the base panel and a corresponding portion of the upper panel.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 17, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,434 Page 6

Art Unit: 3634

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hugh B. Thompson II whose telephone number is (703) 305-0102. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 9 am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Cuomo can be reached on (703) 308-0827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hugh B. Thompson II
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3634

March 7, 2005